

REMARKS

The disclosure has been objected to based on the reference to claim 4 in the specification. This informality has been corrected herein.

Claims 1-2, 5 and 7-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Shioji (U.S. Patent No. 5,763,855). Claims 3 and 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shioji in view of Riedlinger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,895,208), and claims 6 and 9 have been rejected as unpatentable over Shioji in view of Weick et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,811,753).

While Applicants do not concede that the claims as originally filed were not patentable over the art of record, in order to advance prosecution claims 1 and 7 have been amended to recite that the pressure relief valve seals the beam chamber when closed, and is configured to release pressure from the inner chamber only when an internal pressure in the inner chamber reaches a predetermined level. Claims 1 and 7 have also been amended to recite that the pressure relief valve comprises (a) a valve chamber in fluid communication with the inner chamber, and (b) a moveable valve disk configured to seal the valve chamber when the pressure relief valve is closed, and to define an annular gap when the pressure relief valve is open.

Applicants' claims as amended clearly distinguish the art of record. As acknowledged by the Examiner, Shioji does not disclose any details of the relief valve 35. Nor does Riedlinger supply a teaching or suggestion of a pressure relief valve as recited in amended claims 1 and 7. The valve disclosed in Riedlinger does not provide a seal when it is closed. Instead, the valve includes a capillary hole that allows pressure to bleed through the valve when the valve is closed.

Nor is there any suggestion in the art of record that would have led the artisan to select specific features of the Riedlinger valve for use in the system disclosed by Shioji, or in fact to select any particular type of pressure relief valve from the many available pressure relief valves.

Applicants do not concede the statements made by the Examiner regarding Weick, but respectfully submit that these issues are moot in view of the amendments made herein, and that claims 6 and 9 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 7.

Applicant : Martin Lambert
Serial No. : 10/678,753
Filed : October 6, 2003
Page : 7 of 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 15540-010001 / 25620;
18.00277; DS08080

Please charge the fee for the Petition for Extension of Time, and apply any other charges or credits, to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 15540-010001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 19, 2007

/Celia H. Leber/
Celia H. Leber
Reg. No. 33,524

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906